



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,069	02/26/2002	Dwight A. Merriman	16113-1346002	8044
26192 7590 02/23/2010 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER CHAMPAGNE, DONALD				
ART UNIT 3688		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/23/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/082,069

Applicant(s)

MERRIMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Donald L. Champagne

Art Unit

3688

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/13/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 13 November 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In each independent claim (e.g., claim 1 line 6), "more likely" is indefinite. "more likely" than what? The spec. gives no standard by which to measure likelihood.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3688

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 5-11, 18-20, 23-29, 36-38, 41-47, 54 and 55 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Roth et al. (US006285987B1).

7. Roth et al. teaches (independent claims 1, 19, 37 and 55) a method, system and computer readable medium for online re-targeted advertisement selection, the method comprising:

receiving data to build *an information database* (col. 2 lines 1-7 and 11-19), which reads on receiving a description of online activities for a collection of online identities for users (*viewers*) accessing one or more affiliate web sites (*particular web sites* and *a web page*);

identifying a desired behavior (*the view-op was by a viewer who had recently visited a particular web page*, col. 2 lines 37-41), the desired behavior describing a user interaction that indicates that an online identity demonstrating the desired behavior is more likely to be responsive to a re-targeted advertisement (according to applicant's own logic, at para. [0029] of the published application (US 20020082923A1).

analyzing the description of online activities to determine whether a particular online identity appearing in the description of the online activities demonstrates the desired behavior (col. 2 lines 54-58);

generating a watch list of users (the *VOD area of memory 415*, col. 9 lines 40-41 and col. 10 lines 31 to col. 11 line 20) to receive re-targeted advertisements based on analyzing the description of online activities (N.B., a "list" need have no mote than one item);

monitoring, in real-time and from the one or more affiliate web sites, information related to user interaction with the one or more affiliate web sites (col. 2 lines 7-10 and col. 9 lines 23-24);

receiving, from within the monitored information, a request (*View-op*, col. 2 lines 11-19 and col. 8 lines 57-60) to display advertising content to a user;

determining that the user appears in the watch list of users to receive re-targeted advertisements (col. 5 lines 27-32); and

Art Unit: 3688

selecting, in response to the request, advertising content for display based upon determining that the user appears in the watch list of users to receive re-targeted advertisements (col. 5 lines 32-37).

8. Roth et al. teaches at the citations given above claims 7, 25 and 43.
9. "Re-targeted": The term is used only in the preamble of each independent claim, but it is a limitation in the body of dependent claims 11-17, 29-35 and 47-53. The published application (para. [0030]) clearly defines a "re-targeted ad" as an ad that is "history specific to the present user". That is, a "re-targeted" ad is an ad whose selection is based on "the past response(s) of the present viewer". Roth et al. teaches "re-targeted" ads as *the appropriate advertisement* (col. 5 lines 35-37).
10. Roth et al. teaches: claims 2, 20 and 38 (col. 5 lines 24-27); claims 5, 23 and 41 (col. 5 lines 20-23, where a *HTML reference* reads on "a tag"); claims 6, 24 and 42 (col. 19 lines 24-33, where *ISP 712* reads on "a proxy server"); claims 8, 26 and 44 (col. 8 lines 65-67); claims 9, 27 and 45 (col. 18 lines 46-48); claims 10, 11, 28, 29, 46 and 47 (col. 7 lines 34-38 and Fig. 3, elements 16A and 16B, and Fig. 4); and claims 18, 36 and 54 (front page, "article by Toland").
11. Claims 3, 4, 12-17, 21, 22, 30-35, 39, 40, 48-53 and 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth et al. (US006285987B1) in view of official notice.
12. Roth et al. does not teach that: feedback is received by email or FTP message (claims 3, 4, 21, 22, 39 and 40); the re-targeted ad is a coupon when the user visited the web site but did not purchase the product (claims 12, 13, 30, 31, 48 and 49); the re-targeted ad is a reminder when the user made previous but not recent purchases (claims 14, 15, 32, 33, 50 and 51); and the re-targeted ad is best-customer thank you when the user made purchases at some minimum rate (claims 16, 17, 34, 35, 52 and 53). Roth et al. does teach acquiring data on frequency of site visit and purchases (col. 2 lines 37-41, col. 4 lines 11-15, col. 4 line 63 to col. 5 line 5 line 8, col. 8 lines 53-55 and 65-67, and col. 9 lines 57-58).
13. Official notice of this common knowledge or facts well known in the art was taken in the Office action mailed 6 April 2007 (para. 8). Since applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion, it is taken to be admitted prior art (MPEP 2144.03.C).

Art Unit: 3688

14. In addition, Roth et al. does not teach that the tag is a graphic (an image, claims 56-58).

Official notice of this common knowledge or fact well known in the art was taken in the Office action mailed 12 June 2008 (para. 19). Since applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion, it is taken to be admitted prior art (MPEP 2144.03.C).

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed with an amendment on 13 November 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues (center of p. 14 of 15) that the instant claims are "dramatically different" by the use of a "watch list" in place of the reference invention real-time delivery of bid viewing opportunities in the VOD (Roth, col. 9 lines 40-41 and col. 10 lines 31 to col. 11 line 20). The examiner does not agree. The VOD is a watch list, albeit one with only one item, but a watch list nonetheless, because it serves exactly the sale purpose as a longer watch list, but without the disadvantage of delay.

Conclusion

16. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 10082069. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
17. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald L Champagne whose telephone number is 571-272-6717. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Wednesday and Friday. The examiner can

Art Unit: 3688

also be contacted by e-mail at donald.champagne@uspto.gov, and *informal* fax communications (i.e., communications not to be made of record) may be sent directly to the examiner at 571-273-6717.

19. The examiner's supervisor, Lynda Jasmin, can be reached on 571-272-6782.
20. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).
21. **AFTER FINAL INTERVIEW PRACTICE** – Consistent with MPEP § 706.07(f) and 713.09, prosecution generally ends with the final rejection. Examiner will grant an interview after final only when applicant presents compelling evidence in an interview request (form PTOL-413A) that "disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration" (MPEP § 713.09). The burden is on applicant to demonstrate this requirement, preferably in no more than 25 words. Amendments are entered after final only when the amendments will clearly simplify issues, or put the case into condition for allowance, clearly and without additional search or more than nominal consideration.
22. Applicant may have after final arguments considered and amendments entered by filing an RCE.
23. Applicant is advised that, unless a proposed amendment is filed after final and the examiner returns an advisory action with block 3(a) checked (signifying that further search or consideration is required), an amendment filed with an RCE **COULD BE MADE FINAL IN THE FIRST ACTION** in accordance with MPEP § 706.07(b).

16 February 2010

/Donald L. Champagne/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3688